arXiv:1006.5386v1 [math.DG] 28 Jun 2010

The conformal-Killing equation on G_2- and Spin_7-structures

Liana David

June 29, 2010

Abstract. Let M be a 7-manifold with a G_2-structure defined by $\phi \in \Omega^3_+(M)$. We prove that ϕ is conformal-Killing with respect to the associated metric g_ϕ if and only if the G_2-structure is nearly parallel. Similarly, let M be an 8-manifold with a Spin_7-structure defined by $\psi \in \Omega^4_+(M)$. We prove that ψ is conformal-Killing with respect to the associated metric g_ψ if and only if the Spin_7-structure is parallel.

Key words: Conformal-Killing equation, fundamental forms, G_2 and Spin_7-structures.

1 Introduction

A vector field X on a Riemannian manifold (M^m, g) is Killing if its covariant derivative ∇X with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ is totally skew-symmetric, or $\nabla X = \frac{1}{2} dX$ (here and everywhere in this note we identify vector fields with 1-forms using the Riemannian duality). More generally, a p-form $\psi \in \Omega^p(M)$ is Killing if $\nabla \psi = \frac{1}{p+1} d\psi$. In the same way as Killing forms generalize Killing vector fields, conformal-Killing forms generalize conformal-Killing vector fields. In order to define conformal-Killing p-forms ($1 \leq p \leq m$) on (M, g), consider the decomposition of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^p(M)$ into irreducible $O(m)$-sub-bundles:

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^p(M) \cong \Lambda^{p+1}(M) \oplus \Lambda^{p-1}(M) \oplus \mathcal{T}^p(M), \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{T}^p(M)$ is the intersection of the kernels of skew-symmetrization and natural contraction maps. The covariant derivative $\nabla \psi$ of a p-form $\psi \in \Omega^p(M)$ is a section of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^p(M)$ and its projections onto $\Lambda^{p+1}(M)$ and $\Lambda^{p-1}(M)$ according to decomposition (1), are essentially given by the exterior derivative $d\psi$ and the codifferential $\delta\psi$ respectively. The projection of $\nabla\psi$ onto the remaining component $\mathcal{T}^p(M)$ defines the conformal-Killing operator. A p-form ψ is conformal-Killing if it belongs to the kernel of the conformal-Killing operator, i.e. $\nabla\psi$ is a section of the direct sum bundle $\Lambda^{p+1}(M) \oplus \Lambda^{p-1}(M)$, or, equivalently, the conformal-Killing equation

$$\nabla_X \psi = \frac{1}{p+1} i_X d\psi - \frac{1}{m-p+1} X \wedge \delta\psi, \quad \forall X \in TM. \tag{2}$$

is satisfied.

Conformal-Killing forms exist on spaces of constant curvature, on Sasaki manifolds and on some classes of Kähler manifolds (like Bochner-flat or conformally Einstein) where they are closely related to the so called Hamiltonian 2-forms [1]. Conformal-Killings forms exist also on Riemannian manifolds admitting twistor spinors [9]. The space of conformal-Killing forms on a Riemannian manifold is always finite dimensional (even in the non-compact case) and an upper bound for the dimension is realized on the standard sphere, where any conformal-Killing form is a sum of two eigenforms of the Laplace operator, with eigenvalues depending on the dimension and the degree of the form [9].

There are two results in the literature which motivate this note. The first was proved in [9] and states that an almost Hermitian manifold whose Kähler form is conformal-Killing, is necessarily nearly Kähler; the second motivating result was proved in [5] and states that an almost quaternionic-Hermitian manifold whose fundamental 4-form is conformal-Killing, is necessarily quaternionic-Kähler. In this note we prove the analogous statements for the fundamental form of G_2 and Spin_7-structures. More precisely, we prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *i) Let M be a 7-manifold with a G_2-structure defined by $\phi \in \Omega^3_+(M)$ and let g_ϕ be the associated Riemannian metric on M. Then ϕ is conformal-Killing with respect to g_ϕ if and only if the G_2-structure is nearly parallel.*

ii) Let M be an 8-manifold with a Spin_7-structure defined by $\psi \in \Omega^4_+(M)$ and let g_ψ be the associated Riemannian metric on M. Then ψ is conformal-Killing with respect to g_ψ if and only if the Spin_7-structure is parallel.

The plan of this note is the following. In Section 2 we recall basic facts on G_2-structures and we prove the statement for G_2. The statement for Spin_7 is proved in Section 3.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Uwe Semmelmann for useful discussions and interest in this work. Useful discussions with Andrei Moroianu are also acknowledged. This work is partially supported by a CNCSIS grant IDEI "Structuri geometrice pe varietati diferentiabile" (code no. 1187/2008).

2 The statement for G_2

2.1 Basic facts about G_2-structures

Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_7\}$ be the standard basis of $V = \mathbb{R}^7$ and $\{e^1, \cdots, e^7\}$ the dual basis. We shall use the notation $e^{i_1 \cdots i_k}$ for the wedge product $e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_k} \in \Lambda^k(V^*)$. Recall that $G_2 < GL(V)$ is a 14-dimensional compact, connected, simple Lie group defined as the stabilizer of the 3-form

$$\phi_0 := e^{123} + e^{145} + e^{167} + e^{246} - e^{257} - e^{347} - e^{356}. \tag{3}$$

It can be shown any $g \in G_2$ preserves the standard metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_7$ and the orientation of V for which the basis $\{e^1, \cdots, e^7\}$ is orthonormal and positive oriented. Let $*_7$ be the associated Hodge star operator. It follows that any $g \in G_2$ stabilizes also the 4-form

$$*_7 \, \phi_0 = e^{4567} + e^{2367} + e^{2345} + e^{1357} - e^{1346} - e^{1256} - e^{1247}. \tag{4}$$

The standard representation of G_2 on $V \cong V^*$ is irreducible, but the representation of G_2 on higher degree tensors is reducible, in general. For our purpose we need to know the irreducible decompositions of the G_2-modules $\Lambda^2(V^*)$ and $S^2(V^*)$, only. It is known that $\Lambda^2(V^*)$ decomposes into two G_2-irreducible sub-representations

$$\Lambda^2(V^*) = \Lambda^2_7(V^*) \oplus \Lambda^2_{14}(V^*) \tag{5}$$

where

$$\Lambda^2_7(V^*) := \{*_7(\alpha \wedge *_7\phi_0), \ \alpha \in V^*\} = \{\beta \in \Lambda^2(V^*), \ 2 *_7 \beta = \beta \wedge \phi_0\}$$

is of dimension 7 and

$$\Lambda^2_{14}(V^*) := \{\beta \in \Lambda^2(V^*), \ *_7\beta = -\beta \wedge \phi_0\}$$

is isomorphic to the adjoint representation and has dimension 14. Similarly, $S^2(V^*)$ decomposes into two G_2-irreducible sub-representations

$$S^2(V^*) = S^2_0(V^*) \oplus \mathbb{R}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_7 \tag{6}$$

where $S^2_0(V^*)$ denotes trace-less symmetric $(2,0)$-tensors and $\mathbb{R}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_7$ is the 1-dimensional representation generated by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_7$. For proofs of these facts and more about the representation theory of G_2, see e.g. [3], [7].

Consider now a 7-dimensional manifold M with a G_2-structure, defined by $\phi \in \Omega^3_+(M)$. This means that ϕ is a smooth 3-form, linearly equivalent to ϕ_0 (i.e. at any point $p \in M$, there is a linear isomorphism $f_p : T_pM \to V$ such that $f_p^*(\phi_0) = \phi_p$). The stabilizer $G_2 \subset GL(V)$ of ϕ_0 being included in $SO(V)$, the standard metric and orientation of V induce, by means of the isomorphisms f_p, a well-defined metric g_ϕ and an orientation on M, such that f_p is an orientation preserving isometry. We denote by $*_\phi$ the associated Hodge star operator and we freely identify vectors and covectors on M using g_ϕ. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection of g_ϕ. According to [4], [8] the covariant derivative $\nabla\phi$, which is a section of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3(M)$, is actually a section of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$, where $\Lambda^3_7(M)$ is a sub-bundle of $\Lambda^3(M)$, defined as

$$\Lambda^3_7(M) = \{*_\phi(\alpha \wedge \phi),\ \alpha \in T^*M\}.$$

We shall identify $\Lambda^3_7(M)$ with T^*M by means of the isomorphism

$$\Lambda^3_7(M) \ni \beta \to *_\phi(\beta \wedge \phi) \in T^*M, \tag{7}$$

which is the inverse (up to a multiplicative constant) of the isomorphism

$$T^*M \ni \alpha \to *_\phi(\alpha \wedge \phi) \in \Lambda^3_7(M).$$

More precisely, the following general identity holds:

$$*_\phi \left(*_\phi(\alpha \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi\right) = -4\alpha, \quad \forall \alpha \in T^*M. \tag{8}$$

Finally, from the isomorphism (7) and the decompositions (5) and (6), we get the following decomposition of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$ into irreducible sub-bundles:

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M) \cong T^*M \otimes T^*M \cong \Lambda^2_7(M) \oplus \Lambda^2_{14}(M) \oplus S^2_0(M) \oplus \mathbb{R}_\phi(M), \tag{9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^2_7(M) &= \{\alpha \in \Lambda^2(M) :\ 2 *_\phi \alpha = \alpha \wedge \phi\} \\ \Lambda^2_{14}(M) &= \{\alpha \in \Lambda^2(M) :\ *_\phi \alpha = -\alpha \wedge \phi\}, \end{aligned}$$

$S^2_0(M)$ denotes the bundle of symmetric $(2,0)$-traceless tensors and $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M) = \langle g_\phi \rangle$ is the trivial rank one bundle generated by g_ϕ.

From (9), there are 16 classes of G_2-manifolds in the Gray-Hervella classification [8]. The G_2-structure defined by ϕ is called *nearly parallel* if $\nabla\phi$ is a section of the line bundle $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$. When viewed as a sub-bundle of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$, $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$ is generated by $\sum_{k=1}^7 e^k \otimes *_\phi(e^k \wedge \phi)$, where $\{e^1, \cdots, e^7\}$ is a local orthonormal basis of T^*M. Thus $\nabla\phi$ is a section of $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$ if and only if $\nabla\phi$ is a multiple of $*_\phi\phi$.

2.2 Proof for the G_2 statement

In this Section we prove Theorem 1 *i).* We use a representation theoretic argument. Similar arguments already appear in the literature [5], [10], [11]. Let M be a 7-manifold with a G_2-structure defined by $\phi \in \Omega^3_+(M)$. With the notations from the previous Section, we aim to prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 2. *The* 3*-form* ϕ *is conformal-Killing with respect to* g_ϕ *if and only if the* G_2*-structure defined by* ϕ *is nearly parallel.*

In order to prove Proposition 2, define the algebraic conformal-Killing operator

$$\mathcal{T}_3 : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M) \to T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3(M)$$

given on decomposable tensors by

$$\mathcal{T}_3(\gamma \otimes \beta)(X) = \frac{3}{4}\gamma(X)\beta + \frac{1}{4}\gamma \wedge i_X\beta - \frac{1}{5}X \wedge i_\gamma\beta \tag{10}$$

where $\gamma \in T^*M$, $\beta \in \Lambda^3_7(M)$, $X \in TM$ is identified with the dual 1-form and $i_\gamma\beta := \beta(\gamma^\flat, \cdot)$ is the interior product of β with the vector field $\gamma^\flat$ dual to γ. (The operator $\mathcal{T}_3$ usually acts on the entire $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3(M)$, but we consider its restriction to $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$ only, because the covariant derivative $\nabla\phi$ with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of g_ϕ is a section of this bundle). Notice that

$$\mathcal{T}_3(\nabla\phi)(X) = \nabla_X\phi - \frac{1}{4}i_X d\phi + \frac{1}{5}X \wedge \delta\phi, \quad \forall X \in TM.$$

Thus ϕ is conformal-Killing if and only if

$$\mathcal{T}_3(\nabla\phi) = 0. \tag{11}$$

Recall now the decomposition of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$ into irreducible sub-bundles:

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M) \cong \Lambda^2_7(M) \oplus \Lambda^2_{14}(M) \oplus S^2_0(M) \oplus \mathbb{R}_\phi(M). \tag{12}$$

From (11), Proposition 2 is a consequence of the following general result.

Proposition 3. *The restriction of* $\mathcal{T}_3$ *to* $\Lambda^2(M) \oplus S^2_0(M)$ *is injective and the restriction of* $\mathcal{T}_3$ *to* $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$ *is identically zero.*

We divide the proof of Proposition 3 into two Lemmas. First we need to introduce some notations. Define a map

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3(M) \to T^*M \otimes T^*M, \quad \alpha \otimes \beta \to \alpha \otimes *_\phi(\beta \wedge \phi). \tag{13}$$

For any component W in the decomposition (9) of $T^*M \otimes T^*M$, let

$$\mathrm{pr}_W : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3(M) \to W$$

be the composition of the map (13) with the projection from $T^*M \otimes T^*M$ to W, according to the decomposition (9). Let $\{e^1, \cdots, e^7\}$ be a local orthonormal positive oriented frame of T^*M, so that ϕ is of the form (3), and define

$$\eta := e^1 \otimes *_\phi(e^2 \wedge \phi).$$

From its very definition, η is a section of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^3_7(M)$.

Lemma 4. *With the notations above,*

$$(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta) = -\frac{9}{10}(3e^{12} + e^{47} + e^{56}) \tag{14}$$

and

$$(\mathrm{pr}_{S^2_0(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta) = -\frac{7}{4}(e^1 \otimes e^2 + e^2 \otimes e^1). \tag{15}$$

In particular $(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_7(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$*,* $(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_{14}(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$ *and* $(\mathrm{pr}_{S^2_0(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$ *are non-zero and* $\mathcal{T}_3|_{\Lambda^2(M)\oplus S^2_0(M)}$ *is injective.*

Proof. From (18),

$$\mathcal{T}_3(\eta) = \frac{3}{4}e^1 \otimes *_\phi(e^2 \wedge \phi) + \frac{1}{4}e^k \otimes e^1 \wedge *_\phi(e^k \wedge e^2 \wedge \phi) - \frac{1}{5}e^k \otimes e^k \wedge *_\phi(e^1 \wedge e^2 \wedge \phi)$$

where, in order to simplify notations, we omitted the summation sign over $1 \leq k \leq 7$. Therefore, from the identification (7),

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\eta) = {} & \frac{3}{4}e^1 \wedge *_\phi(*_\phi(e^2 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi) + \frac{1}{4}e^k \wedge *_\phi(e^1 \wedge *_\phi(e^k \wedge e^2 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi) \\ & - \frac{1}{5}e^k \wedge *_\phi(e^k \wedge *_\phi(e^1 \wedge e^2 \wedge \phi) \wedge \phi).\end{aligned}$$

The first term from the right hand side of this equality is equal to $-3e^1 \wedge e^2$, using the identity (8). For the second term, we compute

$$*_\phi(e^2 \wedge \phi) = -(e^{367} + e^{345} + e^{156} + e^{147})$$

and, for any $k \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 7\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}*_\phi(e^k \wedge e^2 \wedge \phi) = {} & -\delta_{k1}(e^{47} + e^{56}) - \delta_{k3}(e^{45} + e^{67}) \\ & + \delta_{k4}(e^{17} + e^{35}) + \delta_{k5}(e^{16} - e^{34}) \\ & + \delta_{k6}(e^{37} - e^{15}) - \delta_{k7}(e^{14} + e^{36}).\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$e^1\wedge\phi\wedge *_\phi(e^k\wedge e^2\wedge\phi) = 2\delta_{k1}e^{134567}-\delta_{k4}e^{123456}+\delta_{k5}e^{123457}+\delta_{k6}e^{123467}-\delta_{k7}e^{123567}$$

and

$$*_\phi(e^1\wedge\phi\wedge *_\phi(e^k\wedge e^2\wedge\phi)) = -2\delta_{k1}e^2-\delta_{k4}e^7-\delta_{k5}e^6+\delta_{k6}e^5+\delta_{k7}e^4.$$

Therefore,

$$e^k\wedge *_\phi(e^1\wedge\phi\wedge *_\phi(e^k\wedge e^2\wedge\phi)) = -2(e^{12}+e^{47}+e^{56}),$$

which provides the second term in the expression of $(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$. A similar calculation finally shows that

$$e^k\wedge *_\phi(e^k\wedge *_\phi(e^1\wedge e^2\wedge\phi)\wedge\phi) = 2(-2e^{12}+e^{47}+e^{56}).$$

Putting together the results of these computations, we obtain (14). Relation (15) follows from a similar computation. Using (14) it can be checked that

$$(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)\wedge\phi = \frac{9}{5}(e^{12347}+e^{12356}+e^{34567}) \tag{16}$$

and

$$*_\phi\,(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3)(\eta) = -\frac{9}{10}(e^{12347}+e^{12356}+3e^{34567}). \tag{17}$$

Relations (16) and (17) imply that $(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_7(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$ and $(\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_{14}(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3)(\eta)$ are both non-zero. From the decomposition (12) and an easy argument which uses the Schur's lemma, $\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_7(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3$, $\mathrm{pr}_{\Lambda^2_{14}(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3$ and $\mathrm{pr}_{S^2_0(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3$ non-trivial imply that $\mathcal{T}|_{\Lambda^2(M)\oplus S^2_0(M)}$ is injective, as required. ☐

In order to conclude the proof of Proposition 3 we still need to show that $\mathcal{T}$ is identically zero on $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$. This is done in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5. *The restriction* $\mathcal{T}_3|_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)}$ *is identically zero.*

Proof. Recall that $T^*M\otimes\Lambda^3(M)$ contains $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$ with multiplicity one and the projection $\mathrm{pr}_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)}$ onto $\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)$ has the following expression:

$$T^*M\otimes\Lambda^3(M)\ni\gamma\otimes\beta\to *_\phi(\gamma\wedge\beta\wedge\phi)g_\phi\in\mathbb{R}_\phi(M). \tag{18}$$

Schur's Lemma again implies that $\mathcal{T}_3|_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)}$ is identically zero if and only if $\mathrm{pr}_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)}\circ\mathcal{T}_3$ is identically zero. On the other hand, from definition (10) of $\mathcal{T}_3$

and (18),

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{pr}_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)} \circ \mathcal{T}_3)(\gamma \otimes \beta) &= \mathrm{pr}_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)} \left(e^k \otimes \mathcal{T}_3(\gamma \otimes \beta)(e_k)\right) \\ &= \mathrm{pr}_{\mathbb{R}_\phi(M)} \left(\frac{3}{4}\gamma \otimes \beta + \frac{1}{4} e^k \otimes \gamma \wedge i_{e_k}\beta - \frac{1}{5} e^k \otimes e^k \wedge i_\gamma \beta\right) \\ &= *_\phi \left(\left(\frac{3}{4}\gamma \wedge \beta + \frac{1}{4} e^k \wedge \gamma \wedge i_{e_k}\beta\right) \wedge \phi\right) g_\phi\end{aligned}$$

which is zero, since

$$3\gamma \wedge \beta + e^k \wedge \gamma \wedge i_{e_k}\beta = 0, \quad \forall \gamma \in T^*M, \quad \forall \beta \in \Lambda^3(M).$$

Our claim follows. $\square$

The proof is of Proposition 3 is now completed. Thus Proposition 2 and Theorem 1 *ii)* follow.

3 The statement for Spin_7

3.1 Basic facts about Spin_7-structures

Extend the vector space $V = \mathbb{R}^7$ of Section 2.1 to $V_+ := \mathbb{R}e_0 \oplus V$. The group $\mathrm{Spin}_7 < GL(V_+)$ is a 21-dimensional compact, connected, simply connected Lie group defined as the stabilizer of the 4-form

$$\psi_0 = e^0 \wedge \phi_0 + *_7\phi_0, \tag{19}$$

where we used the isomorphism $\Lambda^4(V_+^*) \cong \Lambda^3(V^*) \oplus \Lambda^4(V^*)$, ϕ_0 and $*_7$ were defined in Section 2.1 and $e^0 \in (V_+)^*$ takes value one on e_0 and annihilates V. In terms of the standard basis $\{e_0, \cdots, e_7\}$ of V_+ and the dual basis $\{e^0, \cdots, e^7\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_0 = {} & e^{0123} + e^{0145} + e^{0167} + e^{0246} - e^{0257} - e^{0347} - e^{0356} \\ & + e^{4567} + e^{2367} + e^{2345} + e^{1357} - e^{1346} - e^{1256} - e^{1247}.\end{aligned}$$

From (19), the stabilizer of e_0 in Spin_7 is isomorphic to G_2. The vector space V_+ has a standard metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_8$ and orientation, for which $\{e^0, \cdots, e^7\}$ is orthonormal and positive oriented and we shall denote by $*_8$ the associated Hodge star operator. It can be shown that Spin_7 preserves this metric and orientation and the map $\mathrm{Spin}_7 \to S^7$ defined by $g \to g(e_0)$ is a G_2-fibration.

The group Spin_7 acts irreducibly on $V_+ \cong V_+^*$, but its action on higher degree forms is reducible in general. For our purpose we need to recall the irreducible decomposition of $\Lambda^3(V_+^*)$ only. As shown in [2], $\Lambda^3(V_+^*)$ decomposes into irreducible Spin_7-modules as

$$\Lambda^3(V_+^*) = \Lambda^3_8(V_+^*) \oplus \Lambda^3_{48}(V_+^*), \tag{20}$$

where $\Lambda^3_8(V_+^*)$ and $\Lambda^3_{48}(V_+^*)$, of dimension 8 and 48 respectively, are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^3_8(V_+^*) &:= \{*_8(\psi_0 \wedge \alpha), \quad \alpha \in V_+^*\} \\ \Lambda^3_{48}(V_+^*) &:= \{\beta \in \Lambda^3(V_+^*), \quad \beta \wedge \psi_0 = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider now a Spin_7-structure on an 8-manifold M, defined by a smooth 4-form $\psi \in \Omega^4_+(M)$ linearly equivalent to ψ_0 at any point of M. Since $\mathrm{Spin}_7 < SO(V_+)$, ψ determines a canonical metric g_ψ and an orientation on M, for which any linear isomorphism $f_p : T_pM \to V_+$ with $f_p^*(\psi_0) = \psi_p$ is an orientation preserving isometry. We denote by $*_\psi$ the Hodge star operator associated to g_ψ and this orientation. We shall freely identify vectors and covectors on M using g_ψ. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection of g_ψ. As shown in [4] and [8] (see also [3]) the covariant derivative $\nabla\psi$ is a section of the tensor product $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M)$, where $\Lambda^4_7(M)$ is a rank 7-bundle generated by 4-forms $X \wedge i_Y\psi - Y \wedge i_X\psi$, for any $X, Y \in TM$. Moreover, the inner contraction map

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M) \to \Lambda^3(M), X \otimes \alpha \to i_X\alpha \tag{21}$$

is an isomorphism [6]. From (20) and (21), the isomorphic bundles $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M)$ and $\Lambda^3(M)$ decompose into irreducible sub-bundles as

$$T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M) \cong \Lambda^3(M) \cong \Lambda^3_8(M) \oplus \Lambda^3_{48}(M), \tag{22}$$

where

$$\Lambda^3_8(M) := \{*_\psi(\psi \wedge \alpha), \quad \alpha \in T^*M\}$$

and

$$\Lambda^3_{48}(M) := \{\beta \in \Lambda^3(M), \quad \beta \wedge \psi = 0\}.$$

It follows that there are four classes of Spin_7-manifolds [6]. The Spin_7-structure is called *parallel* if $\nabla\psi = 0$.

3.2 Proof for the Spin_7 statement

In this Section we prove Theorem 1 *ii)*. We use a similar method like for Theorem 1 *i)*, but the computations are more involved. Let M be an 8-manifold with a Spin_7-structure defined by $\psi \in \Omega^3_+(M)$. With the notations from the previous Section, we aim to prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 6. *The 4-form ψ is conformal-Killing with respect to g_ψ if and only if the Spin_7-structure defined by ψ is parallel.*

Like before, consider the algebraic conformal-Killing operator

$$\mathcal{T}_4 : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M) \to T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M) \tag{23}$$

given on decomposable tensors by

$$\mathcal{T}_4(\gamma \otimes \alpha)(X) = \frac{4}{5}\gamma(X)\alpha + \frac{1}{5}\gamma \wedge i_X\alpha - \frac{1}{5}X \wedge i_\gamma \alpha \tag{24}$$

where $\alpha \in \Lambda^4_7(M)$, $X \in TM$ is identified with a covector using g_ψ and $i_\gamma\alpha := \alpha(\gamma^\flat, \cdot)$ denotes the inner product of α and the dual vector field $\gamma^\flat$ corresponding to $\gamma \in T^*M$. ($\mathcal{T}_4$ usually acts on the entire $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M)$ but we consider its restriction to $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M)$ only, because the covariant derivative $\nabla\psi$ with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of g_ψ is a section of this bundle). Note that

$$\mathcal{T}_4(\nabla\psi)(X) = \nabla_X\psi - \frac{1}{5}i_X d\psi + \frac{1}{5}X \wedge \delta\psi, \quad \forall X \in TM$$

and thus ψ is conformal-Killing if and only if

$$\mathcal{T}_4(\nabla\psi) = 0. \tag{25}$$

From (25), Proposition 6 is a consequence of the following general result.

Proposition 7. *The algebraic conformal-Killing operator $\mathcal{T}_4$ defined by (23) and (24) is injective.*

In order to prove Proposition 7, we will find maps

$$P_8 : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M) \to \Lambda^3_8(M)$$

and

$$P_{48} : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M) \to \Lambda^3_{48}(M)$$

such that the compositions $P_8 \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ and $P_{48} \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ are non-trivial. (The existence of such maps would readily imply, from Schur's lemma and the decomposition (22) of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M)$, that $\mathcal{T}_4$ is injective, as required in Proposition 7).

In order to define the maps P_8 and P_{48} we need to introduce more notations, as follows. First, define

$$p : \Lambda^4(M) \to \Lambda^2(M)$$

by

$$p(\beta)(X, Y) = \langle \psi, i_X\beta \wedge Y - i_Y\beta \wedge X\rangle, \quad \beta \in \Lambda^4(M), \quad X, Y \in TM, \tag{26}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product which on decomposable skew-symmetric multi-vectors (or forms) is defined by

$$\langle X_1 \wedge \cdots X_p, Y_1 \wedge \cdots Y_p\rangle = \mathrm{det} g_\psi(X_i, Y_j).$$

Next, by tensoring the map p with the identity map on T^*M we get a map

$$\mathrm{id} \otimes p : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M) \to T^*M \otimes \Lambda^2(M),$$

which, composed at the right with skew symmetrization, gives a map

$$P : T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M) \to \Lambda^3(M).$$

Finally, composing further P with the projections $\Lambda^3(M) \to \Lambda^3_8(M)$ and $\Lambda^3(M) \to \Lambda^3_{48}(M)$ according to (22), we get the two maps P_8 and P_{48} we were looking for.

In order to show that the compositions $P_8 \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ and $P_{48} \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ are non-trivial, we will find a particular $\eta \in T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4(M)$ such that both $P_8 \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ and $P_{48} \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ take non-zero value on η. To define η, consider a local positive oriented orthonormal frame $\{e_0, \cdots, e_7\}$ of TM and its dual frame $\{e^0, \cdots, e^7\}$, such that ψ has the form

$$\begin{aligned}\psi = {} & e^{0123} + e^{0145} + e^{0167} + e^{0246} - e^{0257} - e^{0347} - e^{0356} \\ & + e^{4567} + e^{2367} + e^{2345} + e^{1357} - e^{1346} - e^{1256} - e^{1247}.\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\alpha_0 := i_{e_0}\psi \wedge e^1 - i_{e_1}\psi \wedge e^0$$

and

$$\eta := e^0 \otimes \alpha_0.$$

From its very definition, α_0 is a section of $\Lambda^4_7(M)$ and η is a section of $T^*M \otimes \Lambda^4_7(M)$. In the following Lemmas we will compute $(P \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\eta)$. Since

$$(P \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\gamma \otimes \alpha) = \frac{4}{5}\gamma \wedge p(\alpha) + \frac{1}{5}e^k \wedge p(\gamma \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha) - \frac{1}{5}e^k \wedge p(e^k \wedge i_\gamma \alpha), \quad (27)$$

for any $\gamma \in T^*M$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda^4(M)$, we need to compute $p(\alpha_0)$, $e^k \wedge p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0)$ and $e^k \wedge p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha_0)$. (As usual, we omit the summation sum over $0 \leq k \leq 7$).

First, we compute $p(\alpha_0)$.

Lemma 8. *The* 3*-form* $p(\alpha_0)$ *has the following expression:*

$$p(\alpha_0) = -8(e^{01} + e^{23} + e^{45} + e^{67}). \quad (28)$$

Proof. From the definition (26) of the map p,

$$p(\alpha_0)(X, Y) = \langle \psi, i_X\alpha_0 \wedge Y - i_Y\alpha_0 \wedge X \rangle, \quad \forall X, Y \in TM.$$

Define a 1-form $\psi(i_X\alpha_0, \cdot)$ by

$$\psi(i_X\alpha_0, Y) := \langle \psi, i_X\alpha_0 \wedge Y \rangle, \quad \forall Y \in TM.$$

With this notation,

$$p(\alpha_0)(X, Y) = \psi(i_X\alpha_0, Y) - \psi(i_Y\alpha_0, X). \quad (29)$$

In terms of the local frame $\{e^0, \cdots, e^7\}$ chosen above,

$$\alpha_0 = -e^{1246} + e^{1257} + e^{1347} + e^{1356} + e^{0357} - e^{0346} - e^{0256} - e^{0247} \quad (30)$$

and, from a straightforward computation,

$$\begin{aligned} i_X\alpha_0 = {} & e^0(X)(e^{357} - e^{346} - e^{256} - e^{247}) + e^1(X)(-e^{246} + e^{257} + e^{347} + e^{356}) \\ & + e^2(X)(e^{146} - e^{157} + e^{056} + e^{047}) + e^3(X)(-e^{147} - e^{156} - e^{057} + e^{046}) \\ & + e^4(X)(-e^{126} + e^{137} - e^{036} - e^{027}) + e^5(X)(e^{127} + e^{136} + e^{037} - e^{026}) \\ & + e^6(X)(e^{124} - e^{135} + e^{034} + e^{025}) + e^7(X)(-e^{125} - e^{134} - e^{035} + e^{024}). \end{aligned}$$

Using this computation and the expression of ψ in the frame $\{e_0, \cdots, e_7\}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(i_X\alpha_0, \cdot) = {} & -4e^0(X)e^1 + 4e^1(X)e^0 - 4e^2(X)e^3 + 4e^3(X)e^2 \\ & - 4e^4(X)e^5 + 4e^5(X)e^4 - 4e^6(X)e^7 + 4e^7(X)e^6. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this relation to Y, skew-symmetrizing the result in X and Y and using (29) we get (28), as required. □

Next, we compute $e^k \wedge p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0)$.

Lemma 9. *The* 3*-form* $e^k \wedge p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0)$ *has the following expression:*

$$e^k \wedge p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0) = -8(e^{045} + e^{023} + e^{067}) - 6(e^{256} + e^{247} + e^{346} - e^{357}). \quad (31)$$

Proof. From the definition (26) of the map p, for any $k \in \{0, \cdots, 7\}$ and $X, Y \in TM$,

$$\begin{aligned} p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0)(X,Y) &= e^k(X)\langle \psi, i_{e_0}\alpha_0 \wedge Y\rangle - e^k(Y)\langle \psi, i_{e_0}\alpha_0 \wedge X\rangle \\ &\quad + \langle \psi, i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge Y \wedge e_k\rangle - \langle \psi, i_Y(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge X \wedge e_k\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

From

$$i_{e_0}\alpha_0 = e^{357} - e^{346} - e^{256} - e^{247} \quad (32)$$

and the expression of ψ in the frame $\{e_0, \cdots, e_7\}$, we get

$$\langle \psi, i_{e_0}\alpha_0 \wedge X\rangle = -4e^1(X), \quad \forall X \in TM \quad (33)$$

and thus

$$e^k(X)\langle \psi, i_{e_0}\alpha_0 \wedge Y\rangle - e^k(Y)\langle \psi, i_{e_0}\alpha_0 \wedge X\rangle = 4e^{1k}(X,Y). \quad (34)$$

It remains to compute the terms of the form $\langle \psi, i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge Y \wedge e_k\rangle$. For this, define a 2-form $\psi(i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha_0), \cdot)$ whose value on a pair of vectors (Y, Z) is equal to $\langle \psi, i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge Y \wedge Z\rangle$. Taking the inner product of $i_{e_0}\alpha_0$ given by (32) with $X \in TM$ and contracting the resulting expression with ψ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha), \cdot) &= e^5(X)(-2e^{04} - e^{37} + e^{26} + 2e^{15}) + e^6(X)(2e^{07} - e^{34} - e^{25} + 2e^{16}) \\ &\quad + e^4(X)(2e^{05} + e^{36} + e^{27} + 2e^{14}) + e^3(X)(-2e^{02} - e^{46} + 2e^{13} + e^{57}) \\ &\quad + e^2(X)(2e^{03} + 2e^{12} - e^{47} - e^{56}) + e^7(X)(-2e^{06} + e^{35} + 2e^{17} - e^{24}). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\psi(i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha), \cdot)$ to (Y, Z) and skew-symmetrizing the result in X and Y we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \psi, i_X(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge Y \wedge Z - i_Y(i_{e_0}\alpha_0) \wedge X \wedge Z\rangle = -4(e^{23} + e^{45} + e^{67})(X,Y)e^0(Z) \\ &\quad +2(e^{05} + e^{36} - e^{14} + e^{27})(X,Y)e^4(Z) + 2(e^{35} - e^{06} - e^{24} - e^{17})(X,Y)e^7(Z) \\ &\quad +2(e^{57} - e^{46} - e^{13} - e^{02})(X,Y)e^3(Z) + 2(e^{52} + e^{61} + e^{43} + e^{07})(X,Y)e^6(Z) \\ &\quad +2(e^{65} + e^{74} + e^{03} + e^{21})(X,Y)e^2(Z) + 2(e^{51} + e^{26} + e^{40} + e^{73})(X,Y)e^5(Z), \end{aligned}$$

for any $X, Y, Z \in TM$. Letting in this expression $Z := e^k$ and using the definition of p together with (34) we get

$$\begin{aligned} p(e^k \wedge i_{e_0}\alpha_0) = 4e^{1k} &- 4\delta_{k0}(e^{23} + e^{45} + e^{67}) + 2\delta_{k4}(e^{05} + e^{36} - e^{14} + e^{27}) \\ &+ 2\delta_{k7}(e^{35} - e^{06} - e^{24} - e^{17}) + 2\delta_{k3}(e^{57} - e^{46} - e^{13} - e^{02}) \\ &+ 2\delta_{k6}(e^{52} + e^{61} + e^{43} + e^{07}) + 2\delta_{k2}(e^{65} + e^{74} + e^{03} + e^{21}) \\ &+ 2\delta_{k5}(e^{51} + e^{26} + e^{40} + e^{73}), \end{aligned}$$

for any fixed k. Relation (31) follows now easily. ☐

Finally, it remains to compute $e^k \wedge p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha_0)$.

Lemma 10. *The 3-form $e^k \wedge p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha_0)$ has the following expression:*

$$e^k \wedge p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha_0) = 6(e^{247} - e^{357} + e^{256} + e^{346}).$$

Proof. From the definition of the map p, one can check that

$$\begin{aligned} p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha_0)(X, Y) = {} & 4(-\delta_{k0}e^{01} - \delta_{k2}e^{03} + \delta_{k3}e^{02} - \delta_{k4}e^{05})(X, Y) \\ & + 4(\delta_{k5}e^{04} - \delta_{k6}e^{07} + \delta_{k7}e^{06})(X, Y) \\ & - \langle \phi, i_X(i_{e_k}\alpha_0) \wedge Y - i_Y(i_{e_k}\alpha_0) \wedge X \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi := e^{123} + e^{145} + e^{167} + e^{246} - e^{257} - e^{347} - e^{356}$$

and $k \in \{0, \cdots, 7\}$ is fixed. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & e^k \wedge (-\delta_{k0}e^{01} - \delta_{k2}e^{03} + \delta_{k3}e^{02} - \delta_{k4}e^{05} + \delta_{k5}e^{04} - \delta_{k6}e^{07} + \delta_{k7}e^{06})) \\ & = 2(e^{023} + e^{045} + e^{067}). \end{aligned}$$

For any $1 \leq k \leq 7$ define a 2-form by

$$\beta_k(X, Y) = \langle \phi, i_X(i_{e_k}\alpha_0) \wedge Y - i_Y(i_{e_k}\alpha_0) \wedge X \rangle.$$

From a long but straightforward computation which uses the expressions of α_0 and ϕ in the frame $\{e_0, \cdots, e_7\}$,

$$e^k \wedge \beta_k = 6(-e^{247} + e^{357} - e^{256} - e^{346}) + 8(e^{023} + e^{045} + e^{067}). \tag{35}$$

Combining (35) with the expression of $p(e^0 \wedge i_{e_k}\alpha)$ we get our claim. ☐

The following Lemma concludes the proof of Proposition 7.

Lemma 11. *The value of* $P \circ \mathcal{T}_4$ *on* η_0 *has the following expression:*

$$5(P \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\eta_0) = -24(e^{023} + e^{045} + e^{067}) + 12(e^{247} - e^{357} + e^{256} + e^{346}). \quad (36)$$

In particular, $(P_8 \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\eta_0)$ *and* $(P_{48} \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\eta_0)$ *are non-zero.*

Proof. Relation (36) follows from relation (27) and the previous Lemmas. A direct check shows that (36) is not of the form $i_X\psi$, for $X \in TM$ and thus $(P_8 \circ \mathcal{T}_{48})(\eta_0)$ is non-zero. Moreover it can be checked that

$$5(P \circ \mathcal{T}_4)(\eta_0) \wedge \psi = -24e^{0234567}.$$

In particular, $(P_8 \circ \mathcal{T})(\eta_0)$ is also non-zero. □

The proof of Proposition 7 is now completed. Proposition 6 and Theorem 1 *ii)* follow.

References

[1] V. Apostolov, D.M.J. Calderbank, P. Gauduchon: *Hamiltonian 2-forms in Kähler geometry I*, J. Diff. Geom. 73 (2006), p. 359-412.

[2] R. L. Bryant: *Some remarks on* G_2*-structures*, Proceed. Goköva Geometry-Topology Conference 2005, Editors: S. Akbulut, J. Önder, R. J. Stern, Internat. Press (2006).

[3] R. L. Bryant: *Metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Ann. of Math., vol. 126, no. 2 (1987), p. 525-576.

[4] R. L. Bryant, S. M. Salamon: *On the construction of some complete metrics with exceptional holonomy*, Duke Math. J., vol. 58 no. 3 (1989), p. 829-850.

[5] L. David: *The fundamental form of almost-quaternionic Hermitian manifolds*, J. Geom. Physics, (4) 60 (2010), p. 574-580.

[6] M. Fernandez: *A classification of Riemannian manifolds with structure group Spin*(7), Annali Mat. Pura ed Applic. vol. 143, no. 1 (1986), p. 101-122.

[7] T. Friedrich, I. Kath, A. Moroianu, U Semmelman: *On nearly parallel* G_2*-structures*, J. Geom. Physics 23 (1997), p. 259-286.

[8] M. Fernandez, A. Gray: *Riemannian manifolds with structure group* G_2, Annali Mat. Pura ed Applic. vol. 132, (1983), p. 19-45.

[9] U. Semmelmann: *Conformal-Killing forms on Riemannian manifolds*, Math. Z. 245 no. 3 (2003), p. 503-527.

[10] A. Swann: *Aspects symplectiques de la geometrie quaternionique*, C. R. Acad. Paris, t. 308, Serie I, 1989, p. 225-228,

[11] A. Swann: *Some remarks on quaternion-Hermitian manifolds*, Archivum Math., vol. 33, no. 4 (1997), p. 349-354.

LIANA DAVID: Institute of Mathematics Simion Stoilow of the Romanian Academy, Calea Grivitei no. 21, Sector 1, Bucharest, Romania; e-mail: liana.david@imar.ro